

had a national address to the country in which he talked about the difficult moral and ethical decision about whether you would have lines of stem cell research allowed that originated from embryos. It was the question of when life begins. Is that an individual? Is it a potential individual? Is it an individual who has any rights?

None of that talked about in the ad. There was the question of umbilical cord blood stem cells, of which I have been privileged to be a leader with CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey and others, and of having a press conference, I remember, with the great basketball star Dr. J, because, in fact, we had found that using blood cord stem cells had actually already been applied to some people with success, including, I believe, to some in this Nation who suffered from sickle-cell anemia.

Forgetting totally about adult stem cells, the ad appeared the very week that the Nobel committee announced its prize for medicine to the two scientists who had unlocked the key in the ability to take adult stem cells and reprogram them back to induced pluripotent cells, meaning that they had the capacity to become different types of cells. Then, in just the 2 weeks before, I believe it was a German experiment in which they successfully cured paralysis in dogs by using cells from the dog's nasal passages.

There can be a legitimate debate about the moral and ethical concerns surrounding stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research, but to have an ad that reduces it to the question of whether a 5-year-old can look in the camera and say, "Why does this Congressman want me to die?"—how does that elevate the debate? How does that in any way enhance our ability to make very difficult decisions?

Does that condemn anybody who happens to have traditional values consistent with the traditional teachings of the Catholic church and other churches to be ridiculed? To be condemned for a lack of concern for fellow human beings? And to have the ad run in the last weeks of the campaign without any ability to respond to it. I ask you, is that civil?

That ad was produced by the pro-majority PAC, by the way, with connections to some Members of the House. They don't have to abide by the rules in terms of advertising, but my question is, where does that leave us as a Nation when we can't talk about difficult, serious issues—issues of morals and issues of ethics and issues of conduct—without reducing it to that level?

Look, I'm, as they say, a big boy. I've been involved in politics and government a long time. I know campaigns can be tough. But is that an excuse for losing any sense of proportionality? Any sense of respect for one another? Any sense of civility?

We hear many in the press decry the level of debate—but yet, not a peep about ads such as that. We hear people

decry the lack of respect for one another—but yet, not a mention made of ads like that, which, I think, eliminate civility.

Some would say the rule of traversing the well while someone is speaking is unnecessary. Why would you complain about that? If you don't understand the basis of civil conduct in the House, you would say that makes no sense at all. If you do understand it, you will understand that it is part and parcel of the entire complex of things we do that either shows respect or disrespect for the institution we serve and for our fellow Members.

I'm not a Pollyanna. I've seen campaigns since I was a very little kid. I think I was 4 or 6 years old when I handed out literature for one of my neighbors who was running for Congress for the first time. I've been blessed to be involved with this. It has been a great ride to be able to represent my fellow constituents here in the House of Representatives in two different tours of service and as the California attorney general. I want tough and vigorous and robust debate, but I do wonder whether the coarseness of the debate, whether the lack of any respect for another's thoughts or another as a person makes us a better or a lesser Nation.

There is something called "appeal to the better angels of human nature." Maybe once in a while we ought to do that here. Maybe once in a while we ought to not only listen to a great speech by Abraham Lincoln or a great speech by Martin Luther King, Jr. or a tremendously written statement by George Washington, but maybe we ought to listen to what they say, and how they say it, and the respect with which they held those who may have disagreed with them.

This is a great institution, representing the greatest country on the face of the Earth. So I don't say this as a loser's lament. Maybe it's a lover's lament. I love this country. I love the State that I represent. I love the people of this country. It is in a real sense an unconditional love, but it is not an uncritical love. We have an obligation to review, to criticize, to constantly guard against the lesser angels of human nature. You can do that with all the vigor in the world, and you can do that with all the respect in the world. If, in fact, we wish to solve the problems of this Nation, recognizing that there has to be some work across the aisle, perhaps the first way in which we do it is to think, how can I be civil in the discussion that I have even though I think my opponent, my counterpart on the other side of the aisle, is dead wrong?

□ 2140

I always thought Ronald Reagan had the best attitude. I would probably sum it up this way. They said that he always saw the glass as half full rather than half empty, but I always thought he had what I called the openness of a

confident and a cheerful conservative. He believed that we ought to conserve essential values of this country; we ought to avoid the fad of the day. And he believed that we ought to be proud in expressing our point of view. But I do believe he also thought that he could sit down with just about anybody and attempt to persuade them, much like my friend and someone who I considered almost a brother, Jack Kemp.

I used to say about Jack: I'm sure there's somebody out there who doesn't like Jack Kemp, but I don't think Jack ever met someone he didn't like. And I don't think Jack Kemp and I don't think Ronald Reagan ever believed they met a man or woman that they couldn't persuade to their side.

And maybe if we kept that in mind, how do we continue to work by putting all of our effort into persuading not only our side but persuading those who disagree with us to the rightness of our position, we might in fact find and they may find that we have far greater commonality of interest and approach than we ever thought.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you know me at all, you know that I don't give up easily. You know that I don't back down from a fair fight or any fight. And you know that I believe deeply in those principles and values that brought me to this place, and I believe deeply that I have not lost them. But I do respect those who have a different point of view, and I respect their sincerity and I respect their genuineness, but I can question their judgment without calling into question their motivation.

And maybe that's the summation of what I'm trying to say here. I have had the great privilege of serving this House for almost two decades. I've had the great privilege of serving 8 years as California's attorney general, so 26 years in public service as an elected official. I don't give up on this place. I don't give up on this country. I don't give up on its people. We've always had difficult times, and the key to solving those difficult times is to recognize their difficulty, recognize their presence, and recognize that we have no right to say it's not our job. When we are in this place in this time, it is our job.

And I would hope and I would pray that we would approach that, and my colleagues would approach that, and those that come after in this new Congress, that they would approach it with a sense of civility and a sense of love of this country. And if we do that, I have no fear for our future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 16, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval the following bills.

H.R. 2606. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4114. To increase, effective as of December 1, 2012, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity

compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 28, 2012, at noon.

EXPENDITURES REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2012 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER M. STEWART, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 25 AND SEPT. 5, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jennifer M. Stewart	8/25	8/28	Turkey		602.00		18,000.00				18,602.00
	8/28	8/30	Jordan		572.00						572.00
	8/30	9/02	Israel		1,494.00						1,494.00
	9/2	9/4	Yemen		484.00						484.00
	9/4	9/5	United Arab Emirates		0.00						0.00
Committee total											21,152.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Speaker of the House, Oct. 26, 2012.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2012

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Harold Rogers	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Hon. Norman Dicks	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Hon. Ken Calvert	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Hon. Tom Cole	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Anne Marie Chotvacs	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
James Kulikowski	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs									1,419.89		1,419.89
Part Commercial Airfare											2,351.70
William Inglee	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00		(⁴) 2,351.70				1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Clelia Alvarado	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
Erin Kolodjeski	7/1	7/4	Czech Republic		1,499.00						1,499.00
	7/3	7/3	Poland								
	7/4	7/8	Italy		1,285.00						1,285.00
	7/6	7/6	Algeria								
Misc. delegation costs							(³)		2,130.15		2,130.15
John J. Bartrum	8/6	8/9	Guatemala		649.00						649.00
	8/9	8/14	Brazil		1,926.00						1,926.00
Misc. embassy costs									2,558.00		2,558.00
Commercial airfare											6,422.90
Jennifer Gera	8/19	8/25	Finland		2,433.00						2,433.00
Misc. transportation costs									230.22		230.22
Commercial airfare									1,564.00		1,564.00
Lisa Molyneux	8/19	8/25	Finland		2,433.00						2,433.00
Commercial airfare									9,771.00		9,771.00